

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. In light of the Office Action, the application has been carefully reviewed, and amended as necessary to place the application in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-15, 17, and 19 are amended.

Claim 2 is cancelled.

Claim Objections

Claim 3 is objected under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim,. Claim 3 has been amended to comply with 37 CFR 1.75(c). Thus, the objection as it applies to claim 3 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sarvar et al. (*Effective Modeling of the Reflow Soldering Process: Basis, Construction, and Operation of a Process Model*). Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the amended claim 13, Sarvar does not disclose a condition table forming portion that forms a condition table that lists a simulation condition of a **part mounting step** and a simulation result outputting portion that executes the simulation of the **part mounting step** wherein the executing portion executes the simulation of the **part mounting step** by sampling the

analysis result data generated based on the simulation condition. Sarvar merely discloses modeling of the **reflow soldering process** which corresponds to the reflow step of the present invention. There is no disclosure in Sarvar that the simulation of the **part mounting step** is executed. Therefore, since every limitation of claim 13 is not taught by the reference, claim 13 is not fully anticipated by Sarvar. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 13 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarvar et al. (*"Effective Modeling of the Reflow Soldering Process: Basis, Construction, and Operation of a Process Model"*) in view of Ekere (*"Solder Paste Printing Process Modeling Map"*). Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claims 1 and 14, neither Sarvar nor Ekere, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable a **part mounting** simulation condition deciding step of selecting a simulated result from the solder printing simulation executing step as a part mounting simulation condition, and a **part mounting** simulation executing step of executing a simulation of the part mounting step based on a part mounting condition comprising the part mounting simulation condition. Sarvar does not disclose the above part mounting simulation condition deciding step

and part mounting simulation executing step, as admitted by the Examiner in the Office action that Sarvar does not explicitly disclose simulating printing or mounting. The Office action states that Ekere teaches simulating **solder paste printing** which corresponds to the solder printing step of the present invention. However, Ekere is silent about simulating the **part mounting** step and deciding its condition. Accordingly, the combination of Sarvar and Ekere does not meet all of the limitations of claim 1 or 14. Therefore, the asserted combination of Sarvar and Ekere does not render claims 1 and 14 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claims 1 and 14 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-12 and 15-16 which are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

Claims 17-19 which are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 14 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to
our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-36409.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 

Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: September 10, 2009